

California Performance Review – Audits Team
SURVEY – Strategic Plans, Performance Measures, & Performance Based Budgeting
Date: May 5, 2004

Response from: California Department of Fish & Game

Preparer: Mark Osuna

Q#	Question:	Yes	No	n/a	Comments:
Strategic Plans:					
1	Has your agency developed a written Strategic Business Plan (Plan) document?	Yes			The plan was initiated in February 1994, adopted in May 1995, and reviewed for possible updates in 1997 and 2000.
	a. What is the date of the most current Plan or update?	2000			The plan was reviewed in September 2000 to compare goals and strategies to the Governor's State of the State Address and known environmental initiatives to ensure the plan comported with statewide goals. The plan continues to comport with the new administrations environmental and wildlife goals. The plan is based on the DFG mission, vision, and is arranged by four themes: 1) Public Service, Outreach & Education, 2) Cooperative Approaches to Resource Stewardship and Use, 3) Management of wildlife from a Broad Perspective, and 4) Organizational Vitality. Plans are dynamic and it is policy to periodically revisit the plan and update it as deemed necessary. In the future, DFG anticipates that it may be necessary to update and restructure its' plan to be more consistent with the new program structure and budget due to the current budget reductions, completion of the DFG Continuity of Government and Operations Plan, and upcoming recommendations by the CPR.
	b. Was your last Plan developed by internal staff or did you hire consultants to prepare the Plan?	Yes			The plan was developed by internal staff (Strategic Planning Team - SPT) with the help and guidance of a consultant and input from various statewide stake holder organizations and individuals via focus groups. The SPT reviewed the DFG existing Vision Statement, Mission Statement, Values, as well as material about priorities prepared previously by employees. Because understanding the concerns of the public is crucial to building effective support for DFG, the SPT conducted focus group meetings statewide to generate input and feedback from external stakeholders. Employee teams in regions and divisions reviewed the information from the stakeholder meetings and provided their interpretation of the results.

Q#	Question:	Yes	No	n/a	Comments:
	c. Did staff involved with strategic planning efforts obtain any related training?	Yes			The consultant provided guidance and training to DFG executive management, SPT, and employee focus group members and external participants through meetings and facilitation.
	d. What agencies (if any) did you submit your Plan to?				The approved plan was submitted to the Resources Agency and other interested agencies and/or parties upon request.
	e. What is your average, annual cost attributable to your strategic planning process each year (i.e. cost of staff time, training, facilities and consultants)?				DFG does not specifically track annual strategic planning costs. Other than the costs attributed to developing the plan, DFG looks upon strategic and operational planning as an ongoing management effort, not a separate effort, and part of managements every day responsibilities (innate) along with other recognized responsibilities. Planning should not be viewed as a separate effort apart from our every day job description.
	f. Is your Plan cross-referenced back to any higher level Plan (i.e. agency, State-wide, or federal program level plan) and if so, what Plan?		No		The DFG plan is not cross referenced back to any other higher level State or Federal plan. However, the plan is based on a concept model referred to as "The Comprehensive Management Plan - CMS", CMS was developed by a national organization called the Organization of Wildlife Planners. CMS is an ongoing cycle of strategic and operational planning, budget development, and evaluation. It incorporates elements of continuous improvement, teamwork, and a bio-geographical and large scale eco-system management approach to fish and wildlife management.
Q#	Question:	Yes	No	n/a	Comments:
1	g. Are Plan Objectives supported by separate Plans for your sub-entities (i.e. separate districts, etc.) or by detailed operating plans for each of your key program areas?		No		The DFG Plan does not contain specific lower level Objectives. The Plan is high level and is built around 4 major Themes which break down to 27 Goals, and 124 Strategies. Goals and accompanying strategies within the plan and are selected as Focus Items for action planning, implementation, monitoring, and evaluation. They are assigned to a program management sponsor who is responsible for implementation through the development of an Action Plan.
	h. Do you participate in the (state-wide) State Strategic Planners Group and if not, why not?	Yes			DFG is a member of the Strategic Planners Group hosted and coordinated by DMV.
	i. What obstacles did you overcome to make your				First: to build consensus and continuity, the DFG needed to hold over 40 meetings with employees to solicit suggestions on how

Q#	Question:	Yes	No	n/a	Comments:
	strategic planning efforts a success?				to improve our operations and approach the future. Second: once some key issues and goals were identified, DFG needed to hold focus group meetings with external stakeholders to understand the perceptions, attitudes, values, and priorities of a wide cross section of the public. Third: information gleaned from stakeholder meetings needed to be processed and drafted into a draft plan. Fourth: the draft plan needed to be circulated for review by employees, stakeholder focus group members, and other interested groups and individuals prior to finalization and approval.
	j. What general successes have you experienced from implementing strategic planning efforts?				<p>The plan provides a programmatic framework to guide the Department and attempts to anticipate the future of California's wildlife resources, describes actions to improve organizational effectiveness, and responds to concerns raised by those most affected by DFG operations. In implementing, DFG has restructured its programs and organization and developed management information systems such as activity/expenditure time reporting aligned with the new program structure. Other new business information systems have also been developed. As a companion to the plan, DFG also developed an Information Technology Plan Strategic Plan, Marine Region Strategic Plan, and Fish and Game Commission Strategic Plan. These higher level plans are also continuously updated.</p> <p>In general, DFG has been successful in:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Developing an integrated program that identifies needs and opportunities in education and communication. 2. Establishing law enforcement priorities. 3. Developing contingency plans for public safety issues. 4. Implementing clarifying definitions and applications of policies for the FGC 1600 process as they relate to stakeholder groups. 5. Coordinating implementation and use of GIS and setting standards for data gathering and sharing. 6. Implementing a Land Contracts policy and process as an incentive for private landowners to maintain habitat on their lands.

Q#	Question:	Yes	No	n/a	Comments:
					<p>7. Implementing a program with the Wildlife Conservation Board to acquire land in anticipation of future mitigation needs – a mitigation land bank.</p> <p>8. Establishing a fishery improvement and protection projects in coordination with marine commercial and sport fishing interests: White Seabass Pilot Program</p> <p>9. Conducting central valley in-stream flow studies in cooperation with the US Fish and Wildlife Service.</p> <p>10. Establishing priorities for resource assessment and research.</p> <p>11. Directing activities toward maintaining, enhancing, and restoring wildlife communities on lands managed by DFG for wildlife benefit.</p> <p>12. Improving the budgeting and fiscal management systems.</p> <p>13. Improving internal communication and coordination on water, timber harvest, and endangered species policies and issues.</p> <p>14. Establishing a clear process for developing policies and DFG positions in the areas of water, timber harvest, and endangered species.</p>
2	If you have never developed a Plan or have not recently updated your Plan, why not?			N/A	
Performance Measures:					
3	Have you developed benchmarks and performance measures that are linked to your Goals and Objectives for key program areas, as part of your Plan or independent of a Plan?		No		<p>At this time, DFG has not developed benchmarks or performance measures for specific program goals and objectives. In order to do so, DFG would need to develop uniform standards for 6 major program element areas of responsibilities administered and coordinated by 4 Headquarter Divisions, and 7 Field Regions. Currently, the lower level program work components and activities which describe our programs in more detail (i.e.; biodiversity, fish, wildlife, habitat, law enforcement, environmental, and administration) break out to more than 100 components and several hundred activities. Developing performance standards would require an immense undertaking. Additionally, DFG is not aware of any uniform</p>

Q#	Question:	Yes	No	n/a	Comments:
					performance standards ever established by the US Fish and Wildlife Services or other State Wildlife Agencies.
	a. What type of process (i.e. automated information system or manual) do you have in place to gather and measure performance data?				As previously stated, DFG does not measure performance with defined benchmarks or performance measures. However, DFG has been successful in implementing a comprehensive activity time reporting system that captures employee hourly effort and expenditures at the lower level program activities that roll up to component, element, and program level. The time also ties back to organizational budget allotments and fund sources which directly link to the DFG budget and accounting systems.
	b. How often do you monitor program performance?				Although DFG does not have formal performance benchmarks and measures, statewide monitoring for program compliance, effectiveness, and expenditures are ongoing and continuous. This is a major responsibility of the DFG Headquarter Divisions who are assigned program policy guidance and direction. Regions are assigned field operational responsibilities and report progress with individual scientific plans to Divisions. Results are reported to executive management and corrective action and/or adjustments are made as needed.
	c. Who analyzes these performance measurement reports?			N/A	
	d. Do you regularly analyze the viability/propriety of the measures and adjust or eliminate them, if needed?			N/A	
	e. What action do you take if measurable operating objectives are not being met?			N/A	
	f. How is this information integrated into the following year's Plan?			N/A	
	g. Have any program performance reviews or internal (or external) audits been conducted of any of your program performance measures?			N/A	<p>Please Note: Although not based on the type of performance measures being addressed in this survey, the DFG internal Audits Branch has conducted numerous audits of DFG program functions and performance. The Audits Branch is committed to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Providing management independent information and assurance involving the Department's operations and programs. • Providing management assurance involving compliance

Q#	Question:	Yes	No	n/a	Comments:
					<p>with laws relating to the sale of licenses and permits (Fish and Game Code Article 2, Chapter 3, Division 2, and Title 14).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Promoting compliance with laws and regulations involving the Environmental Filing Fee program (Fish and Game Code 711.4, Assembly Bill 3158). Providing management assurance that there is general compliance with the Commercial Fish Landing Tax and Business Licensing Law (Article 7.5 of the Fish and Game Code). Detection of irregularities and information technology (IT) security.
	h. What obstacles did you have to overcome (or are you trying to overcome) to make your performance measuring efforts a success?			N/A	
	i. What general successes have you experienced from your performance measuring efforts?			N/A	
4.	If you do not measure performance for your key programs, why not?			N/A	See questions 3, 3a.and 3b.
Performance Based Budgeting					
5.	Have you implemented a Performance Based Budgeting process for any of your programs?		No		<p>DFG did not participate in the prior Performance Based Budgeting Project. However, in FY 00/01 and FY 01/02, the Department experimented with its' own comprehensive work planning process (model) that broke out the Departments programs into 37 statewide work plan groups. DFG allowed staff in 16 of the work plan groups to practice statewide coordination of program effort, and set specific and agreed-upon program Key Results and Key Indicators across organizational lines based upon program priorities and resources available. Since this was a practice session to see what worked and what didn't, flexibility was allowed each WPG in writing up their evaluation to accommodate their reporting of accomplishments based on how measurement information was designed and collected. The reporting on hours used and/or dollars expended was optional due to financial systems which were e not in place to fully support the work planning process. The Department's pilot work</p>

Q#	Question:	Yes	No	n/a	Comments:
					<p>planning effort was terminated at the end of FY 01/02 and showed that a statewide process is useful, and functionally viable. It can help to manage future operations by documenting effort and program accomplishments.</p> <p>Lessons Learned: the following are known future obstacles to overcome in order to implement a true comprehensive statewide operational work planning system that includes program performance outcomes & measures for specific products and services tied to the DFG governors program budget by organization:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Implement additional infrastructure changes for program & organizational improvement to help develop and refine a statewide work planning process; • To modernize the process, devote more resources to the Business Information System (BIS) Work Plan Module and Oracle Discoverer System to produce automated Work Plans and financial reports; • Market the work planning process via the Intranet to increase support and awareness of achievements. • Develop a new Department Strategic Plan based on the current program structure and implement Strategic Goals as Key Results within operational Work Plans; • Require all managers and supervisors to be educated in strategic planning and operational planning. Consider a Planning Academy; • Revise performance appraisals for managers and supervisors to include work planning rating factors; and • Make the work planning process part of the annual budget cycle to help the Department's Budget Review Team develop Budget Concepts and Budget Change Proposals based on the work plan.
	a. Does your operational budget link to your Plan and/or specific performance measures?		No		

Q#	Question:	Yes	No	n/a	Comments:
	b. Have you been successful in utilizing performance measures make budget decisions?			N/A	
	c. Have you identified requirements for meeting financial targets within your Plan?			N/A	
	d. What are the consequences for not meeting those requirements?			N/A	
6.	Do you have a formal contingency plan in place to deal with budget deficits?			N/A	DFG current expenditure projections do not anticipate deficits in any fund. Department Management reviews monthly expenditure projections and identifies possible over-expenditures. Significant issues are address as needed.
7.	Are budgetary responsibilities established and reviewed regularly?			N/A	DFG Executive and Senior Management review, discuss, and address department-wide issues weekly. Budget issues are addressed as identified.
8.	If you have not implemented a performance based budgeting process in the past, what obstacles prevented you from considering it?			N/A	
9.	How well prepared are you for implementing a Performance Based Budgeting process in the future?				Based on experience and known infrastructure, system, and education deficiencies, it is estimated that it would require a full year to develop the process, train staff, setup systems, and 2 to 3 years to implement and refine.